

NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES



January 26, 2017

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST

FOIA OFFICER
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
National Freedom of Information Office
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (2822T)
Washington, DC 20460

Filed via FOIA Online

Re: **Puget Sound**

To whom it may concern:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *et seq.*, we are writing to request the disclosure of public documents within the control of your agency. I make this request on behalf of Northwest Environmental Advocates (NWEA).

NWEA is a regional non-profit environmental organization founded in 1969 and dedicated to preserving and protecting natural resources in the Northwest and the nation. NWEA works through advocacy, litigation, and education to protect and restore water and air quality, wetlands and wildlife habitat. NWEA has a long history of interest and involvement in environmental issues in the Northwest and the nation, in particular seeking to use the Clean Water Act programs to restore and maintain water quality for the protection of human health, fish, and wildlife.

This request concerns the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) funding, actions, inactions, policies, or statements on the Washington Department of Ecology's (Ecology) plans, lack of plans, studies, Clean Water Act section 303(d) actions and inactions, NPDES permit controls and lack thereof, and water quality standards and criteria or lack thereof pertaining to nutrient pollution in Puget Sound.

I. FOIA Request

In answering this request, please consider "documents" to include: reports, memoranda, internal correspondence, including electronic mail or other communications, policy and scientific reports, meeting notes, telephone notes, and summaries of conversations and interviews, computer records, and other forms of written communication, including internal staff memoranda. In your response, please identify which documents correspond to which requests below. This request also covers any non-identical duplicates of records that by reason of notation, attachment, or other alteration or supplement include any information not contained in the original record. Additionally, this request is not meant to be exclusive of other records which, though not specifically requested, would have a reasonable relationship to the subject matter of this request.

This request applies to all described documents whose disclosure is not expressly prohibited by

www.NorthwestEnvironmentalAdvocates.org

P.O. Box 12187, Portland, OR 97212-0187 Phone (503) 295-0490 Fax Upon Request

Printed on 100% post-consumer recycled, non-de-inked, non-rebleached paper

law. If you should seek to prevent disclosure of any of the requested records, we request that you: (i) identify each such document with particularity (including title, subject, date, author, recipient, and parties copied), and (ii) explain in full the basis on which non-disclosure is sought. Additionally, if any information or documents are withheld, please explain how EPA reasonably foresees that disclosure would harm an interest protected by a specific FOIA exemption, or how the disclosure of such information or documents is prohibited by law. In the event that you determine that any of the requested documents cannot be disclosed in their entirety, we request that you release any reasonably redacted or segregable material that may be separated and released. Furthermore, for any documents, or portions thereof, that are determined to be potentially exempt from disclosure, we request that you exercise your discretion to disclose the materials, absent a finding that sound grounds exist to invoke an exemption.

Pursuant to this request, please provide all documents prepared or utilized by, in the possession of, or routed through the EPA related to:

1. Communications between EPA and Ecology regarding plans for, the possibility of, or timing of the development of a TMDL for Puget Sound;
2. Communications between EPA and Ecology regarding the possibility of and content of an alternative to developing a TMDL for Puget Sound;
3. The development, or lack of development, of a TMDL for Puget Sound including the parameters, modeling, source control, data and information supporting, content, geographic scope, and time lines of developing such a TMDL, as well as the challenges, barriers, costs, and politics pertaining to the development, approval, or implementation of such a TMDL;
4. Past and future delays and scheduling of the Deschutes River Watershed Area Budd Inlet and Capitol Lake Project TMDL;
5. The issuance of NPDES permits by Ecology or EPA authorizing discharges to Puget Sound in the absence of a TMDL;
6. The issuance of NPDES permits by Ecology or EPA authorizing discharges to Puget Sound of pollutants or parameters affecting dissolved oxygen;
7. EPA evaluation of progress by the State of Washington regarding the likelihood the state will "complete numeric nutrient criteria development and adoption within the agreed upon timeframes," as stated by EPA in a letter to Ecology dated September 14, 2005, including identification of those timeframes, identification of "milestones as scheduled in the plan," updates submitted by Ecology, EPA reviews and assessment of progress, or lack thereof, on completion of the numeric criteria or alternatives to those criteria including but not limited to development of models for all of Puget Sound and whether they have been used to protect against excess nutrients;
8. Parameters included in the Ecology schedule for addressing 303(d) listings submitted as a part of the Department of Ecology, 2014 Water Quality Assessment & 303(d) List Prioritization Schedule;

9. Grants from EPA to Ecology or other entities pertaining to study, analysis, modeling etc. of or related to Puget Sound nutrient pollution;
10. Consideration of the study, analysis, or control of Puget Sound nutrient pollution in Performance Partnership Agreements between EPA and Ecology including but not limited to the identification of Puget Sound NPDES permits as “high priority,” actions needed to meet the restoration of Puget Sound to a healthy state by 2020, the meaning of not holding Ecology permits to higher-than-federal standards in the PPA revised July 2015, estimates of completing Puget Sound nutrient studies by 2013 in the PPA revised July 2013, the meaning of the “integrated approach to nutrient control” reported in the September 2012 PPA Program Status Report; and
11. Ecology’s response, if any, to EPA’s March 16, 2011 Nutrient Framework memorandum.

For purposes of this request:

- “Puget Sound” means any portion or all of Puget Sound or the Salish Sea, Puget Sound estuaries, tributaries that enter Puget Sound, or watersheds that drain to Puget Sound.
- “TMDL” means any TMDL for dissolved oxygen, nitrogen, phosphorus, algal growth, and/or nutrients in Puget Sound as defined by federal rules.
- “NPDES permits” means any NPDES permit issued by EPA or Ecology that authorizes discharges to Puget Sound, directly or indirectly, of oxygen-demanding wastes, nitrogen, phosphorus, or nutrients in general.

If there are large documents or categories of documents that you suspect we may already have, or that we might not want, please call us and ask in order to avoid waste and/or delay. We specifically exclude from this request copies of Ecology-published studies on nutrients and/or dissolved oxygen in Puget Sound, unless EPA has added to those documents in any way (e.g. handwritten notes).

II. Fee Waiver Request

We hereby request a waiver of fees for costs incurred in locating and duplicating these materials, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(iii), because disclosure “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” Following is a response to the fee waiver requirements set out in 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1) and (l)(2)(i)-(ii).

As is discussed further below, NWEA is involved in litigation regarding various aspects of the Clean Water Act implementation in Washington State including water quality standards and nonpoint source control. Use of information sought through FOIA is a recognized public use and benefit under FOIA’s fee waiver standard. Courts have long recognized that the use of such laws to further the public interest through challenges to agency action may actually represent some of the highest and best application of public access laws. For example, the Ninth Circuit has ruled that a FOIA requester established a *prima facie* justification for a fee waiver when “[i]n particular, they made it clear to [the agency] that they meant to challenge publicly the scientific basis for the western pond turtle listing denial.” *Friends of the Coast Fork v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 110 F.3d. 53, 55 (9th Cir.1997); *see also NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. 132, 143 n. 10 (1975) (evidence of prior litigation interest does not decrease right of access under

FOIA). Indeed, almost 30 years ago, the federal court for the District of Columbia, citing Supreme Court precedent, ruled that “[l]itigation to seek redress of violation of law is a right established by the first amendment . . . and restrictions thereupon are subject to strict scrutiny.” *Idaho Wildlife Fed’n v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, Civ. No. 82-1206 (D.D.C. July 21, 1983) (citing *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415 (1962)), Slip Op. at 7. In that case, the court rejected the Forest Service’s denial of a fee waiver request because it relied on a regulation that proscribed such waivers whenever the information was “sought for use in litigation against the federal government.” *Id.* at 3. The court ruled that such a proposition is “untenable” because:

The concept of the “private attorney general” is well-established, and certainly had its genesis in the environmental field. Indeed, when private litigation against a government agency vindicates a significant public policy and creates widespread benefit, policy en-courages such litigation by awarding the plaintiff attorney’s fees and costs.

Id. at 8 (citation omitted). The court noted that the Idaho Wildlife Federation “is a non-profit organization which states that its purpose in litigation against the Forest Service is to ensure compliance with environmental laws” and that “such activity would appear to be of the type generally considered to be public interest.” *Id.* Because policy-based disputes with agencies, as well as administrative challenges, “cannot be done completely without the ability to seek judicial review,” the court enjoined the Forest Service’s broad-brush rejection of fee waiver requests simply because they might interfere with an agency’s unfettered pursuit of its agenda. *Id.* at 8-9. Indeed, litigation to enforce federal laws is an essential function of organizations, such as and including NWEA, which act in a watchdog capacity.

A. Whether the subject of the requested records concerns “the operations or activities of the government.”

This request concerns a variety of formal and informal documents from or to EPA regarding the federal agency’s grant support of studies on nutrient pollution in Puget Sound and its oversight responsibility for state permitting, state water quality standards, and state 303(d) programs. EPA’s actions and inactions pertaining to the study, analysis, control or lack of control over nutrient discharges to Puget Sound concerns the operations of the government because EPA grants, actions, and inactions are taken to support or required by the Clean Water Act. Therefore, this fee waiver request involves records that are readily identifiable as limited to “the operations or activities of the government,” specifically in this instance the operations and activities of the U.S. EPA to study and control nutrient pollution in Puget Sound and to support such actions by Ecology.

B. Whether the disclosure is “likely to contribute” to an understanding of government operations or activities.

EPA’s interest in Puget Sound is available on EPA’s website but there is no information on the degree to which EPA has supported Ecology action and inaction to study and control nutrients in Puget Sound and the outcomes of those efforts or lack thereof. There are many studies on Ecology’s website that suggest that EPA has an interest in the issue and has provided financial support and may or may not have exercised its oversight authority in reviewing Ecology actions or inactions. Without access to records, should they exist, to demonstrate what action, if any, EPA has taken to require or support the study and control of nutrients discharged to Puget Sound, the public has no way of knowing whether EPA has complied with the requirements of that law.

Similarly, without access to these records, NWEA cannot evaluate whether EPA has used its oversight authority to ensure that Ecology meets the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

Release of the requested records will allow the public to understand what actions EPA has taken or not taken to study and control or support the study and control of nutrients in Puget Sound by Ecology. To the best of our knowledge, EPA has not provided any of these documents to the public nor has made them available on its website. Therefore, there is no other way to obtain this information on EPA actions other than through use of the FOIA. For this reason, reviewing records of EPA's action or inaction will be "meaningfully informative" and is therefore likely to contribute to an understanding of what EPA has done or not done to control nutrient pollution in Puget Sound. Having such information is also "meaningfully informative" in that it ensures NWEA and other organizations do not engage in frivolous or unfounded litigation.

C. Whether disclosure of the requested information will contribute to "public understanding."

Disclosure of the requested records to NWEA will contribute to public understanding because the organization has expertise in this subject area of the records, an intention to disseminate the information obtained, and the connections with organizations and individuals in Washington and elsewhere who are most likely to use the information contained within the records. NWEA has a track record of working with a broad range of people, to assist them by conveying our understanding of EPA policies and provide EPA documents. NWEA is known for being generous with its time and information, despite its extremely limited resources. At a minimum, the audience for the information that NWEA has requested is environmental, recreational, fishing, tribal, and health organizations in Washington that are interested in ensuring that water quality standards are sufficiently protective of human health, fish, and wildlife, that 303(d) programs are supportive of meeting standards, and that permitting is conducted to meet standards. In the past, NWEA has shared similar information with state agencies, federal employees, tribal governments, as well as representatives of municipal and industrial dischargers. NWEA will continue to share such records as well as information analyzed from records with this same list of interests.

In addition to using its relationships and networks with environmental organizations and environmental attorneys across the country, NWEA will also disseminate the records and/or its analysis of the records through the following means, as appropriate: through the internet from its website, through social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter, through commentary to the press, through public forums in which it participates, in its newsletters, through emails to networks of organizations, and through formal public comments and other formal documents prepared for agencies. For example, NWEA routinely submits public comments on proposed NPDES permits to Ecology pertaining to nitrogen discharges to Puget Sound.

NWEA's investigation and evaluation of the records will be made available to other parties after it has been completed. NWEA will use the records requested to evaluate the quality of EPA decision-making and to better facilitate public participation in state and EPA processes during triennial reviews, 303(d) list and TMDL development, and permit issuances, all of which occur regularly. NWEA's dissemination of the records and of its own evaluation of the records will educate the public and advance public understanding of EPA's decision-making. Thus, the release of these records will significantly contribute to the public's understanding and oversight of EPA's decision-making under the Clean Water Act.

NWEA has both the ability to interpret and to disseminate the records and/or information from this request because of its participation in all regulatory processes that take place under the Clean Water Act. NWEA has the expertise to evaluate this information and is able to disseminate the information from the records, or the records themselves, directly and indirectly with public interest organizations interested in water pollution through emails, phone calls, meetings, list serves specifically devoted to communications between public interest organizations, and through its website and social media, as well as in formal communications with state and federal public agencies.

D. Whether the disclosure is likely to contribute “significantly” to public understanding of government operations or activities.

Courts have held that the factor of whether the disclosure will contribute “significantly” to the public understanding is satisfied where the information requested is new, would supplement information currently available to the public, or add to the public oversight of the government’s activities. *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1286 (9th Cir. 1987); *Judicial Watch of Florida v. U.S. Justice Dept.*, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23441, at *8 (D.D.C. 1998). The requested information has not, to the best of NWEA’s knowledge, been released to the public and, therefore, qualifies as new. *Or. Natural Desert Ass’n v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 24 F. Supp. 2d 1088, 1095 (D. Or. 1998) (finding that information supporting a Bureau of Land Management NEPA analysis, but which had not been released publicly, was new for the purposes of FOIA fee waiver). EPA’s website contains none of the requested information. Moreover, there is no way, short of a FOIA request, to ensure that all the publically available documents are the universe of documents pertaining to this subject matter.

Where an organization seeking a fee waiver has explained its ability to disseminate information to the public by way of presentations to the public, other public interest organizations, participation in conferences, articles in various media and through its website, a court held that the group had met the dissemination prong of the public interest test:

Other courts have found requestors’ statements of intent to disseminate requested information through newsletters, popular news outlets and presentations to the public interest groups, government agencies and the general public sufficient to entitle an organization to a fee waiver Therefore, in light of [Western Watersheds Project’s] statements, the Court finds that WWP adequately detailed its ability and intent to publicize the disclosed information to more than just a narrow segment of the public. Moreover, the Court finds that if it adopted the BLM’s position [that WWP would only disseminate information to a narrow audience], it would set the bar for fee waivers impermissibly high, especially in light of Congress’ intent to have the fee waiver liberally construed.

Western Watersheds Project v. BLM, 318 F. Supp. 2d 1036 (2004). Moreover, courts have held that if it is a “close call” as to whether a requestor has met one of the factors, in light of Congressional intent that the fee waiver provision be liberally construed, a non commercial entity should be given the benefit of the doubt and be granted the fee waiver. *Forest Guardians v. Dept. of the Interior*, 416 F. 3d 1173 (10th Cir. 2005). Likewise, the court in *Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance v. BLM*, 402 F. Supp 82 (2005) held that an organization’s statements describing how it has commented on similar issues in federal proceedings and issued a report on a similar matter was sufficient to show it had the expertise and ability to disseminate the requested information. And, as in some of the fee waiver requests addressed in this appeal, the

records concern agency inaction, a court has found that a requestor's statements concerning the agency's failure to meet statutory requirements and how the requested records would shed light on those failures was sufficient to demonstrate that the request would make a significant contribution to the public understanding. *Physicians Comm. for Responsible Medicine v. Dept. of Health and Human Serv.*, 480 F.Supp.2d 119, 122-23 (D.D.C. 2007).

Release of the records requested will contribute to the ability of nonprofit public interest oversight organizations such as but not limited to NWEA to oversee the activities of EPA in light of its actions and inactions pursuant to the CWA and in support of CWA goals. It will also contribute to the ability of NWEA and others to oversee the activities of the EPA, with regard to regulatory actions that are intended to ensure that such standards are met. As discussed above, NWEA participates in state rulemaking, in EPA review of state rulemaking, in permitting actions and the issuance of TMDLs and 303(d) lists, and in litigation. NWEA also participates in matters of EPA national policy, in areas such as standards and TMDLs. It also shares documents and information with other organizations that engage in those activities. NWEA will also disseminate the information to organizations through listserves, websites, meetings, memoranda, and direct sharing of the records as appropriate. Only by understanding the EPA's actions and inactions can NWEA meaningfully participate in its public oversight watchdog function and assist other organizations to do the same.

E. Commercial interests.

Where a court has found the request to be primarily in the requestor's commercial interest, there has been specific and clear evidence of that interest. *See, e.g., VoteHemp, Inc. V. DEA*, 237 F. Supp 55 (2002)(VoteHemp's website contained links to commercial interests and the requestor's mission included business promotion). There is no such concern here. NWEA has no commercial interest in the requested records. NWEA has no mechanism to obtain funds from the use of the records, does not promote the records or analysis of them as a commercial concern, and its website contains no links to commercial interests. NWEA is a non-profit public interest environmental advocacy organization working to protect public health and the environment in the Northwest and across the country. Therefore, the considerations of 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1) with regard to the possible commercial interests of NWEA do not apply because NWEA has no commercial interests and will realize no commercial benefit from the release of the requested information or as a result of any subsequent analysis it may perform on the records sought.

In conclusion, for the reasons set forth above and in the additional materials filed herewith, Northwest Environmental Advocates is clearly entitled to receive a public interest fee waiver for this FOIA request just as it did with its previous identical request.

We look forward to your response. Please feel free to contact me at 503/295-0490 if you have any questions about how to respond to this request.

Sincerely,



Nina Bell
Executive Director